1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

V.

TIMOTHY DORAN,

Defendant.

Case No. CR12-001RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION
TO WITHDRAW

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's "Motion to Withdraw as Counsel for Defendant" (Dkt. # 69). Having considered the facts set forth in the motion and the arguments made during the hearing on June 10, 2013, the Court finds the following:

- (1) On March 22, 2013, the Court held an evidentiary hearing related to the sentencing of Defendant for failing to register as a sex offender. Dkt. # 64. During the hearing, the Court heard testimony from Vietnamese Detective Ngoc Hoang and Girlie Pineda. <u>Id.</u> The hearing was continued to May 23, 2013. <u>Id.</u> On May 15, 2013, the Court granted Defendant's motion to continue the hearing. The hearing is scheduled to resume on September 12, 2013. Dkt. # 68.
- (2) Defendant has not presented sufficient arguments to warrant the appointment of new counsel. First, his request is untimely. The parties and the Court are in the middle of an evidentiary hearing. Granting the motion to withdraw would require the Court to hold a new evidentiary hearing. The government would be required to call the

witnesses who previously testified, including Detective Hoang who lives in Vietnam.

The Court is not inclined to require such extreme measures without sufficient indication that the attorney-client relationship has been damaged.

(3) Furthermore, Defendant supports his motion with the same arguments he

(3) Furthermore, Defendant supports his motion with the same arguments he raised when he sought to replace his first lawyer in April 2012. Dkt. # 28, 29. He has not presented any new reasons why his current lawyer in particular should withdraw. Based on Defendant's and counsel's statements outside the presence of the government, the Court finds no indication that the attorney-client relationship has suffered irreparable harm. Thus, the Court DENIES Defendant's motion (Dkt. # 69).

DATED this 10th day of June, 2013.

Robert S. Lasnik

United States District Judge